

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Amendments

All of the previously presented claims have been cancelled in favor of new claims 46-60. The Title has been amended as suggested by the examiner. The application element subtitles (37 C.F.R. §1.77) have been added. No new matter is added.

Claim Objections

The objections to claims 28 and 39 are now moot.

Prior Art Rejections

Before addressing the substance of the prior art rejections, applicant would emphasize that new independent claims 46 and 57 recite a lamp reflector having concave reflector panels, providing the appearance of a flat-sided pyramid when sectioned, and each reflection element has a convex surface facing the light source.

Accordingly, in respect of the rejection over McNamara '573 under 35 U.S.C. §102, which rejection is respectfully traversed, the cited reference fails to show at least convex reflection elements, and so the rejection should now be withdrawn. From the perspective of the light source, McNamara '357 shows concave "curved corner reflector surfaces" 72a through 72f (col. 4, ln. 53-54)

In respect of the rejection over the combination of Gordin and McNamara '573 under 35 U.S.C. §103, which rejection is respectfully traversed, the rejection incorrectly characterizes Fig. 12B of Gordin as showing "convex" light elements. Although the "raised edges 36 and lower edges 38" (col. 7, ln. 3-4) do not appear to be shown in Fig. 12, the drawing clearly shows segment 18F with rectilinear, step-like portions. By any definition, "convex" requires curvature, and curvature is not shown in Gordin.

Further, segment 18G is described as having "convex shape[d] depressions" (col. 7, ln. 20-21) although Fig. 13B depicts the "textured, peened, or dimpled surface" (*id.* at ln. 19-20) as convex from outside the reflector; *i.e.*, *concave* from the perspective claimed by applicant. The Gordin structure is thus opposed from applicant's claimed reflection elements, which are recited as lying on a concave surface in respect of the light source and being convex in geometry. Fig. 13B of Gordin clearly shows the curvature of the inner and outer surface to be in the same direction, concave in relation to the light source, whereas applicant's are claimed and depicted with opposite curvatures. The structure of previous claim 36 (regarding the convex reflection elements) is thus found in neither Gordin nor McNamara '357. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

The previous rejections of the dependent claims are rendered moot by the present amendments.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of all of the rejections, and further and favorable action, in the form of allowance of all of the pending claims, is now believed warranted, and such actions are earnestly solicited.